Sunday. On the seventh day they met with the general public in order to proclaim the Gospel. No other day was available for that purpose. Their own meetings, however, were held on the first day, the Lord's day, as it was called to distinguish it from the Jewish Sabbath. As the Mosaic dispensation passed away, its ritual observances naturally ceased, according to the Pauline declaration: "For the Priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a change also of the law." (Heb. vii: 12.) And by the time Roman emperors were prepared to favor their Christian subjects the keeping of Sunday as the Lord's day had become so universally recognized as a Christian duty, that imperial edicts were issued for the protection of the Nazarenes in this feature of their religion. It is no more true that the observance of Sunday is due to the efforts of Constantine than it would be to say that he invented the sign of the cross. The very fact that he legislated in favor of the first day of the week is proof positive that that day had already been set apart by the Christians for worship. Hear a testimony from one of the early fathers. Justin, in his Apology, A. D. 150, says: "We, all of us, assemble together on Sunday, because it is the first day in which God changed darkness and matter, and made the world. On the same day, also, Jesus Christ, our Savior, rose from the dead."

When all the facts connected with this subject are considered, it is impossible to find any reasonable answer to the question of the origin of the consecration of Sunday as the Christian Sabbath, except this, that it was done by the Apostles of our Lord and probably in accordance with the teachings He gave them during the forty days between His resurrection and ascension, or else as a result of revelations given afterwards. The modern Sabbatarians array themselves in battle for a cause that has support neither in history nor in sacred writ. That they, besides, should come in conflict with the civil laws, is to be regretted. We believe, however, that the proper course to pursue in regard to that sect is to prove to them their mistake and treat them with that tolerance which Paul emphasizes as a mark of Christianity and recommends to all the churches that were composed of members of various opinions on holidays.

INSTITUTING AN IOWA COURT.

It is not an infrequent procedure for journals throughout "the great West" to revert to pioneer times in their own localities, so as to get matters relating thereto in proper historical shape; neither is it infrequent to notice in such pioneer annals the names of men intimately associated with the people who founded Utah, thus showing that the settlers of our fair Territory have left the impress of their pioneering genius in nearly every one of the western states. A recent illustration of this is given in the Council Bluffs *Nonpareil* of February 11, a copy of which has been handed to us by Hadley D. Johnson, Esq., of this city.

The *Nonpareil* has an article on the "Early history of the present judiciary system of Pottawatamie county," Iowa, in which appear the names of well known and highly respected citizens of Utah. Among these are the late Alex. McRae, for many years Bishop of the Eleventh ward in this city; the late Orson Hyde, of the Council of Apostles; the late George P. Stiles, once associate justice of Utah; Hadley D. Johnson, and others. The *Nonpareil* recites that previous to 1851 there was no regular judiciary in that section of the state; but that "at the organization of the county in 1848 the board of supervisors acted in the dual capacity of judge and jury, and assisted by several magistrates they dispensed whatever justice there was to be had in those days; the manner in which they ran things was very interesting and can be seen in the first record of Pottawattamie county now in the auditor's office." The institution of a district court is then recounted as follows:

In 1851 the Sixth judicial district of Iowa was formed in southwestern Iowa. Pottawattamie county was by far the most important part of the new district, and court was opened in Kanesville May 5, 1851. James Sloan was elected judge and took his seat on that day. The other functionaries of the court were Alex. McRae sheriff, and Evan M. Greene clerk. Previous to Judge Sloan's elevation to the bench he had served for three years as county clerk. He made an excellent record in the latter office and had an easy thing of it at the first election for district judge held in the county. The original formation of the court forms an interesting chapter in the first record kept by the clerk. It is now in possession of the present incumbent of that office and is highly prized both as a work of technical skill and historical importance. There were only four attorneys practicing before the "honorable court of Pottawattamie county" at that early day, and the quartet of legal lights had a monopoly on the scant practice which they conducted in connection with their other business. They were William M. LeCompte, Esq., George P. Stiles, Esq., Hadley D. Johnson, Esq., and Orson Hyde, Esq. It was a question how they should be admitted, and as there was no regularly admitted attorney belonging to the new court it became necessary to waive ceremony and make a start. George P. Stiles, Esq., presented William M. LeCompte, Esq., and on motion he was admitted to the bar. LeCompte Esq., then performed the same ceremony for Mr. Stiles and the other two aspiring lawyers. It is not reported in the records whether they at once formed a bar association, but that they were held in high esteem is evident from the scrupulous care with which the suffix "Esq," is placed after their names whenever they appear in the court records. After the bar admission ceremonies had been completed Judge Sloan appointed William M. LeCompte, Esq., prosecuting attorney, and the court proceeded to business.

The record of cases the first day of court shows that number one on the list heard was entitled "The State of Iowa vs Ed. O. Beebe, assault and battery, appealed by defendant from the decision of Jacob McGraw, justice of the peace." In this the decision of the justice was overturned, as it also was in the second case heard, where Alpheus P. Haus had been convicted of assault and battery in Justice McGraw's court. Most of the cases heard by Judge Sloan grew out of personal encounters between the woolly citizens of the bustling young western town; and this general statement of affairs by the *Nonpareil* will recall to old settlers vivid memories of scenes in which, fortunately, Utah was not a participator to any great extent.

When the gold excitement of 1849 commenced this point became a favorite crossing for the tide of immigration. From 1850 to 1853 a stream of prospectors crowded all the ferries and the city presented the appearance of a vast encampment. It also brought to the frontier thousands of people of no credit to any community, and this locality passed through those tragic scenes common to all western cities just taking shape. This brought much business to the young court, although Judge Lynch was also active in those days.

TREAT THE QUESTION FAIRLY.

A local morning cotemporary has been, for some time, indulging in a controversy with one of its correspondents. The latter is an advocate for the submission of the question of prohibition to the vote of the people at the same time the Constitution of the new State shall be voted for. Every time one of his communications appears in the paper referred to the editor peppers him with small polemic pebbles. The correspondent ought to keep our cotemporary well supplied with correspondences, because in addition to his own arguments in favor of the submission of the prohibition question to the people, the paper which affords him space is also doing good service in the same line, although this assistance is quite unintentional. The NEWS took the ground, from the beginning of the movement to procure the submission to the vote of the people of this important question, that it could see no valid reason against it. The controversy now pointed to has certainly not weakened the attitude of this journal. The State is the political autonomy entire, as the body is the whole anatomy of the human corporeal structure. When one part is affected detrimentally, the whole system is injured, and therefore vitally interested. Let the whole people decide the question as a whole.

In treating upon this or any other question there is no need to resort to misrepresentation. Intentionally or otherwise, this has been done by the before-mentioned cotemporary. If the discoloration of an important fact was not intended it would even then be almost inexcusable, the truth of the matter being easy of ascertainment. The newspaper in question thus presents what it claims to be the intention of the prohibition promoters: "It is proposed to submit to a vote of the entire people of Utah the question whether the manufacture and sale and giving away of an intoxicant shall be prohibited in Utah."

The plain inference to be drawn from the language within quotation marks is that the proposal is to wholly prohibit the manufacture, sale or giving away of any intoxicating liquor.

Here is the article which the promoters of the prohibition cause desire submitted to the popular vote, separate and apart from the vote on the Constitution:

No person, association or corporation shall, within this state, manufacture for